arXiv:1201.2388v1 [math.HO] 11 Jan 2012

A Translation of the T. Levi-Civita paper: *Interpretazione Gruppale degli Integrali di un Sistema Canonico*

Rend. Acc. Lincei, s. 3ª, vol. VII, 2º sem. 1899, pp. 235–238

G. Saccomandi[a], R. Vitolo[b]*,

[a] *Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale, Università degli Studi di Perugia, 06125 Perugia;*

[b] *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università del Salento, Via per Arnesano, 73100 Lecce.*

January 12, 2012

Abstract

In this paper we provide a translation of a paper by T. Levi-Civita, published in 1899, about the correspondence between symmetries and conservation laws for Hamilton's equations. We discuss the results of this paper and their relationship with the more general classical results by E. Noether.

Keywords: Levi-Civita, point symmetries, conservation laws, Hamilton's equations, Noether's theorem.
MSC 2010 classification: 01-XX

1 Introduction

Tullio Levi-Civita (1873–1941) has been one of the most important mathematicians of the last century. Levi-Civita is best known for his work on the absolute differential calculus and because he was the founder with Gregorio Ricci-Curbastro of the subject now known as tensor analysis. Levi-Civita

*This work has been partially supported by the Università degli Studi di Perugia, Università del Salento, GNFM of INdAM.

published nearly two hundred papers about classical mechanics, hydromechanics, thermodynamics, elasticity, the strength of materials, astronomy, electromagnetism, optics, relativity and quantum mechanics and pure mathematics. He was also the author of several treatises, and in collaboration with Ugo Amaldi he wrote an important reference book in classical mechanics: *Lezioni di Meccanica Razionale* [11]. This is a three volumes book first published in 1922 and then revised for the last time, after the death of Levi-Civita, by Amaldi in 1949.

In reading [11] it is impossible not to notice that this book does not contains any mention to the Noether's 1914 theorem [14]. Indeed at page 98 of the wonderful book [8] we read:

> The surveys of Vizgin [1972] and Kastrup [1987] and our own research have yielded a surprisingly small number of references to Noether before 1950. In particular, we are still astonished by the absence of citations dealing with invariance and its related mathematics in the corpus of the then standard but now classical textbooks on the variational calculus. There is nothing on invariance problems in the treatises of Tonelli [1921], **Levi-Civita and Amaldi** [1923], Bliss [1925], Forsyth [1927], Ames and Murnaghan [1929] who treat cyclic coordinates but not general invariance properties, nor later, in that of Elsgolc [1952], originally written in Russian and translated into English in 1961, cited by Gel'fand and Fomin [1961], nor in Pars [1962].

For someone who knows the Levi-Civita scientific production it is truly hard to believe that the non-citation of Noether's theorem in [11] was possible. This fact is also clear from a bird's eye reading of [11]. The authors of this wonderful treatise consider in great detail, for a book in classical Mechanics, the theory of transformations, applying it to different topics. They also refer to the fundamental papers of Sophus Lie[1]. Moreover, both Levi-Civita and Amaldi have been very active in studying the theory of transformation groups applied to various problems of mathematical physics. For example in a recent issue of the journal *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* Sergio Benenti has provided the English translation of the Levi-Civita paper *Sulle trasformazioni delle equazioni dinamiche* [9]. It is interesting to report a comment by the editorial board of *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* on [9]:

> This paper is truly a pioneering work in the sense that the real power of covariant differentiation techniques in solving a con-

[1]To be more precise about this point, in the second part of the second volume of [11] you can find a bio sketch of Sophus Lie at page 302 and he is cited in 9 pages.

> crete and highly nontrivial problem from the theory of dynamical systems was demonstrated. The author skillfully operates and weaves together many of the most advanced (for that times) algebraic, geometric and analytic methods. Moreover, an attentive reader can also notice several forerunning ideas of the method of moving frames, which was developed a few decades later by E. Cartan.

We are not experts in the history of mathematics and we have not got a complete and detailed knowledge of all the writings of Levi-Civita and Amaldi (for example of all the letters that they have written and for which there is still a record), but it seems to us that there are no documents of these two mathematicians where the question of the theorem of Noether is discussed. The journal where [14] is published is cited in the famous text [17], so it is plausible to think that Levi-Civita would read it more or less regularly.

We looked at the collected papers of Levi-Civita in an effort to try to understand possible reasons for this fact[2], and we found a very interesting short note written at the onset of his career: the paper [10].

Our aim is to provide an English translation of [10] because we think that in this short note the connection between infinitesimal generators of symmetries (in the sense of Sophus Lie) and first integrals has been proposed for the first time in its general setting.

Let us stress in a clear and definitive way that we are not claiming that in [10] you can find the two Noether's theorems from [14]. First of all Levi-Civita considers Hamiltonian finite dimensional systems and the connection between Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formulation was not rigorously stated. Moreover, Noether's results are much more general than what is contained in the short note by Levi-Civita. What we are claiming is that the connection between Lie's theory of groups and conserved quantities in mechanics was already clear in [10].

To support our claim in Section 3 we provide a paraphrase of the paper [10] using a modern language (see, *e.g.*, [2, 3, 15]). We think that this *exercise* is helpful to clarify our point of view. We point out that in [10] there are very few references, among which we found a citation to two short notes by Maurice Lévy and a short note of Valentino Cerruti. In those references, integrals of motion are in some sense connected with the symmetries of the mechanical system, but in an episodic and incomplete way.

[2]Clearly, here we are approaching the problem in a purely speculative framework. It is possible that Levi-Civita and Amaldi have never read the paper by Noether and they were simply unaware of the result.

We end up this introduction with two remarks.

First of all we think that it is impossible to have a reasonable answer to our starting question: why are Noether theorems not cited in [11]? We believe that the general problems about the inception and the reception of the Noether theorems before 1950 stressed out in [8] in the case of Levi-Civita have to be summed up to the following specific facts:

- The connection between symmetries and constant of motions was already clear to Levi-Civita. This means that maybe Levi-Civita was not so surprised by the result of Noether and therefore maybe he was not so interested in reading the paper.

- Levi-Civita was interested more in the Hamiltonian formalism than in the Lagrangian one[3]. We recall that Olver says in [15] that: *The Hamiltonian version of Noether's theorem has a particularly attractive geometrical flavour, which remains somewhat masked in our previous Lagrangian framework.* We know that Levi-Civita was one of the first mathematicians interested in the geometry of Mechanics, and it is possible that he was more interested in this aspect that in the Lagrangean setting.

The second remark is about the fact that papers [10], [9] and many other papers by Levi–Civita seem to have not properly been noticed in the literature. Because of the racist laws introduced in Italy by the fascist regime, the notice of the death of Levi–Civita was only given by the Osservatore Romano and by foreign academies[4]. For a long time a complete list of the publications by Levi–Civita was not available. Moreover, Ugo Amaldi's wish was that no obituary of him had to be diffused after his death. Therefore, it is not strange at all that the less famous papers of Levi–Civita have been forgotten for a long time.

2 Translation of the paper[5]

Mr. Maurice Lévy was the first to observe[6] that a displacement without deformation is possible in a generic manifold if and only if it is possible to

[3]Ugo Amaldi took the decision to stop his research activity soon in his career and therefore was no more up to date on the scientific literature to help Levi-Civita in discovering interesting papers.

[4]Levi-Civita in 1938 was forced to retirement due to the promulgation of laws against Jews by the fascist regime.

[5]Presented by the Fellow V. Cerruti in the session of 5 November 1899

[6]*Comptes Rendus*, t. LXXXVI, 18 February and 8 April 1878.

remove one of the variables from the square of the linear element by a suitable transformation. This is equivalent to say that there exists an homogeneous, linear first integral for the geodesics of the manifold.

Prof. CERRUTI reexamined the topic[7] also considering the case where conservative forces are acting. The above relation between first integrals and rigid displacements can be formulated in the language of groups as follows[8]. If the kinetic energy and the potential admit the same infinitesimal point transformation, then the equations of motion have an homogeneous linear first integral, and vice versa. (The left-hand side of the integral, as written in canonical form, coincides with the symbol of the infinitesimal transformation).

A natural question arises: does any group-like character still correspond to non-linear integrals?

The answer is affirmative and this holds for any canonical system

$$\text{(S)} \qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{dx_i}{dt} = \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \\ \dfrac{dp_i}{dt} = -\dfrac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \end{cases} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n),$$

as long as one does not only consider point transformations (with respect to x, operating on p by prolongation), but more general contact transformations of x, p. One finds indeed that *integrals of a canonical system and contact transformations in x, p changing the system into itself are essentially the same thing. For each integral there exists a transformation and conversely. The characteristic functions of the transformations* (by suitably fixing an addend that remains apriori undetermined) *can be made to coincide with the left-hand sides of the corresponding integrals.*

The theorem is proved in a very simple way. Let

$$\delta f = \xi_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} + \cdots + \xi_n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} + \pi_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_1} + \cdots + \pi_n \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_n}$$

be an infinitesimal transformation in x, p. Suppose that the increments ξ, π are functions of x, of p and of a parameter t, which is invariant under the transformation. By considering x, p as functions of t we can extend δf to the derivatives dx_i/dt, dp_i/dt, and the respective increments will be obtained by

[7] In this *Rendiconti*, ser. 5ª, vol. III, 1895.

[8] See the Notes *On the motion of a rigid body about a fixed point*, in this *Rendiconti*, ser. 5ª, vol. V, 1896 and the elegant proof of Mr. LIEBMANN, *Math. Ann.*, B. 50, 1897.

the formulae

$$\delta\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \frac{d\delta x_i}{dt} = \frac{d\xi_i}{dt},$$
$$\delta\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \frac{d\delta p_i}{dt} = \frac{d\pi_i}{dt}.$$

Applying the transformation δf to system (S) yields

$$(1) \qquad \begin{cases} \delta\left\{\dfrac{dx_i}{dx} - \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right\} = 0 \\ \delta\left\{\dfrac{dp_i}{dt} + \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\right\} = 0 \end{cases} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n).$$

The above identities must be satisfied by virtue of S if the system admits the infinitesimal transformation δf.

Let us introduce the hypothesis that δf be a contact transformation. The ξ and the π are derivatives of the same function $W(x, p, t)$[9], according to

$$(2) \qquad \xi_i = \frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i}, \qquad \pi_i = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i},$$

and the symbol δf becomes the Poisson bracket (W, f).

Equation (1) can be written as

$$d\,\frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i} - \left(W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right) = 0,$$
$$d\,\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} - \left(W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\right) = 0,$$

hence, evaluating derivatives and using (S):

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p_i \partial t} + \left(H, \frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i}\right) - \left(W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right) = 0,$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x_i \partial t} + \left(H, \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}\right) - \left(W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\right) = 0,$$

that, by virtue of bracket properties, is equivalent to

$$(1') \qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\left[\dfrac{\partial W}{\partial t} + (H, W)\right] = 0, \\ \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left[\dfrac{\partial W}{\partial t} + (H, W)\right] = 0. \end{cases}$$

[9] Lie–Engel, *Theorie der Transformationsgruppen*, vol. II, cap. 14.

From the above equations it follows that $\partial W/\partial t + (H, W)$ depends on t only. Now W, the characteristic function of δf, is determined by (2) up to an additive function of t. One can always choose this in such a way that the following identity holds:

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} + (H, W) = 0. \tag{1"}$$

Clearly, one can also obtain (1) starting from (1") and tracing each step backwards. Therefore (1") is a necessary and sufficient condition for the canonical system 3.1 to admit the infinitesimal contact transformation (W, f).

On the other hand (1") precisely states that $W = \text{const}$ is an integral of system (3.1). This proves the statement formulated above.

Note that if W is linear and homogeneous in p (and in this case only), then δf comes from the prolongation of a point transformation with respect to x. It follows that the existence of a homogeneous linear integral and the existence of a point transformation changing the canonical system into itself are concomitant facts. In particular, the theorem by Lévy–Cerruti is reobtained by supposing that $H = T - U$ with T homogeneous of second degree in p and that U is a function of x only. It follows indeed from (1"), by splitting terms of different degree in p, that T and U separately admit the transformation W.

3 Some comments on the Levi-Civita paper

The paper by Levi-Civita considers an Hamiltonian system

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \quad \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{3.1}$$

where $x_i = x_i(t)$ and $p_i = p_i(t)$. In a modern geometric language we can say that the phase space is of the form $\mathbb{R} \times T^*M$, with coordinates (t, x_i, p_i), where $\mathbb{R}$ represents time and M is an n-dimensional manifold representing positions. Now, it is clear that $F(t, x_i, p_i)$ is a first integral for (3.1) if and only if

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \{F, H\} = 0$$

on the manifold described in the phase space by the solutions of (3.1). Here, as usual, $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ are the *Poisson's brackets* which if we are working in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ are defined as

$$\{F, H\} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \tag{3.2}$$

(here and in what follows sums on repeated indexes are understood). Then Levi-Civita considers an infinitesimal transformation δf for the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ as dependent variables with respect to the independent variable t. In other words, his transformation preserves the projection $\mathbb{R} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$. This is clear when he speaks of the *incrementi* of the variables x and p, denoted as ξ_i e π_i. So, his infinitesimal transformation δf can be regarded as the time dependent vector field

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \xi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \pi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \tag{3.3}$$

on $\mathbb{R} \times T^*M$. In this infinitesimal transformation Levi-Civita assumes that time is invariable, *i.e.* the coefficient of $\partial/\partial t$ is null. In other words, $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a *vertical* vector field.

By introducing new coordinates $\dot{x}_i$ and $\dot{p}_i$ for the derivatives dx/dt and dp/dt we see that the *incrementi* of those variables in Levi-Civita's language are just the coefficients of the first prolongation of $\boldsymbol{v}$ to the first jet space of the projection $\mathbb{R} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathrm{pr}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{v} = \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \pi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + \frac{d\xi_i}{dt}\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{x}_i} + \frac{d\pi_i}{dt}\frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{p}_i}.$$

In the above formula we are considering $d \cdot /dt$ as a total derivative:

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \dot{x}_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \dot{p}_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$$

(in [15] the notation D_t is used). The fact that the expression for coefficient functions of $\mathrm{pr}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{v}$ is very simple is related with the fact that we are not transforming the independent variable t.

If we rewrite (3.1) as

$$E_i^{(1)} := \frac{dx_i}{dt} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} = 0, \quad E_i^{(2)} := \frac{dp_i}{dt} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n$$

the infinitesimal invariance criterion is given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{pr}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{v}(E_i^{(1)}) = 0, \\ \mathrm{pr}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{v}(E_i^{(2)}) = 0, \\ E_i^{(1)} = 0, \\ E_i^{(2)} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Levi-Civita requires that $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a *contact transformations* (see [12] or [5], for example). More precisely, $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a parameter-dependent

infinitesimal contact transformation, the parameter being t as stated before. Clearly, this kind of transformation should not be confused with contact transformations of $\mathbb{R} \times T^*M$ where t is the dependent variable, where π_i is defined as the total derivative of W (see [2]).

Let us recall some basic facts on infinitesimal homogeneous contact transformations. Infinitesimal homogeneous contact transformations of T^*M are vector fields X on T^*M. Their flow F_s maps a cotangent vector (x_i, p_i) into another cotangent vector (x_i', p_i') in such a way that, if $p_i = (d_{(x_i)}f)_i$, where $f\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$, then $p_i' = (d_{(x_i')}f')_i$, where $f' = f \circ F_s\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$. This characterization is equivalent to the requirement that the flow preserves the contact form (or Liouville form) $\theta = p_i dx_i$ on T^*M, or that the equation $L_X\theta = 0$ (here L_X stands for the Lie derivative) holds. That implies the conditions

$$\pi_j = -p_i \frac{\partial \xi_i}{\partial x_j}, \qquad p_i \frac{\partial \xi^i}{\partial p_j} = 0.$$

It follows that, if $W = p_i \xi^i$, then $\xi_i = \partial W/\partial p_i$ and $\pi_i = -\partial W/\partial x_i$. The function W is uniquely defined.

Note that more general non-homogeneous contact transformations can also be considered. A modern treatment of the subject can be found in [3, Chapter 2].

In our case we construct a function $W_t(x_i, p_i)$ for any value of the parameter t, hence we obtain a time-dependent function $W(t, x_i, p_i)$ which is clearly defined up to an arbitrary function of time.

Using this fact the (3.4) reads

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i}\right) - \left\{W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right\} = 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}\right) - \left\{W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\right\} = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Consider the first equation (3.5) i.e

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p_i \partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p_i \partial x_j}\frac{dx_j}{dt} + \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}\frac{dp_j}{dt} - \left\{W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right\} = 0,$$

on the solutions of (3.1) we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial p_i \partial t} + \left\{H, \frac{\partial W}{\partial p_i}\right\} - \left\{W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\right\} = 0.$$

A similar computation for the second equation in (3.5) says

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x_i \partial t} + \left\{H, \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}\right\} - \left\{W, \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\right\} = 0.$$

We have shown

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\left[\frac{\partial W}{\partial t}+\{H,W\}\right]=0,\quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left[\frac{\partial W}{\partial t}+\{H,W\}\right]=0 \tag{3.6}$$

and being W defined up to an arbitrary function of time we have the desired result.

It is possible to recast the above discussion using a geometric framework, but we think that our simple discussion is sufficient to clarify that in [10] we can find a clear and complete connection between symmetries of the Hamilton equations (according with Lie theory) and first integral of finite dimensional systems.

Of course, Noether's theorem [14] is formulated for Euler–Lagrange equations in field theory. On the other hand, we could use a geometric viewpoint to show that in mechanics, if the Lagrangian is regular[10], then the integral curves of the Euler–Lagrange equations and of the Hamilton equations are (at least locally) in bijection (see, *e.g.*, [1, p. 218]). Hence, the symmetries of the two equations are (at least locally) in bijection. Of course, such a correspondence between symmetries makes sense only if we allow symmetries to be generalized (or higher) (see, *e.g.*, [15, 3]), in such a way that we can consider symmetries of the Euler–Lagrange equation that depend on velocities. On the other hand, it is known from Noether's paper [14] generalized symmetries allow for a complete identification between symmetries and conserved quantities. So, generalized symmetries must be taken into account if we wish to state Noether's theorem in the greatest generality possible.

Deeper discussions on the relationship between symmetries of the Euler–Lagrange equations and the Hamilton equations with different connections with Noether's theorem can be found in the papers [4, 7, 13, 16, 18, 19] in mechanics and [6] in field theory.

Our starting idea was to understand why the theorem of Noether is not cited in the treatise of rational mechanics by Levi-Civita. Clearly we cannot provide a definite answer to this question, but we have discovered the short note by Levi-Civita that clearly adds interesting information to the history of the correspondence among symmetries and conservation of laws.

Acknowledgements. We thank Yvette Kosmann-Schwarzbach, Giuseppe Gaeta and Renato Vitolo for their interest in our work and for many useful comments that helped us to improve the paper.

[10] this means that the Legendre transformation is a local diffeomorphism

References

[1] R. Abraham and J. Marsden: Foundations of Mechanics, Benjamin, 1978.

[2] G.W. Bluman, A.F. Cheviakov and S.C. Anco: Applications of symmetry methods to partial differential equations, Applied Mathematical Sciences 168, Springer 2010.

[3] A.V. Bocharov, V.N. Chetverikov, S.V. Duzhin, N.G. Khor'kova, I.S. Krasil'shchik, A.V. Samokhin, Yu. N. Torkhov, A.M. Verbovetsky and A.M. Vinogradov: Symmetries and Conservation Laws for Differential Equations of Mathematical Physics, I. S. Krasil'shchik and A. M. Vinogradov eds., Translations of Math. Monographs **182**, Amer. Math. Soc. (1999).

[4] J. Butterfield: On Symmetry and Conserved Quantities in Classical Mechanics, in: Festschrift for Jeffrey Bub, ed. W. Demopoulos and I. Pitowsky, University of Western Ontario Series in Philosophy of Science 2, Kluwer 2006.

[5] L.P. Eisenhart: Continuous Groups of Transformations, Princeton Univ. Press (1933); reprinted by Dover (1961).

[6] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin: *Symmetries of Dynamically Equivalent Theories*, Brazilian Journal of Physics **36** no. 1B, 2006.

[7] X. Gràcia and J.M. Pons: *A Hamiltonian approach to Lagrangian Noether transformations*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **25** (1992), 6357–6369.

[8] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach: The Noether Theorems. Invariance and Conservation Laws in the Twentieth Century, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 2011.

[9] T. Levi-Civita: Sulle trasformazioni delle equazioni dinamiche, Annali di Matematica, 24, 255-300, 1896. (English translation by S. Benenti in Regular and Chaotic Dynamics, 14, 580-614, 2009).

[10] T. Levi-Civita: Interpretazione gruppale degli integrali di un sistema canonico, Rend. Acc. Lincei, s. 3^a, vol.VII, 235–238, 1899. The paper is available at `http://poincare.unile.it/vitolo/LC.pdf`

[11] T. Levi-Civita and U. Amaldi: Lezioni di Meccanica Razionale, Zanichelli, Bologna, 1922.

[12] S. Lie and F. Engel: Theorie der Transformationsgruppen, vol. 2 ch. 14 (1890) Teubner, Leipzig.

[13] G. Marmo and E.J. Saletan: *Ambiguities in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism: transformation properties*, Il Nuovo Cimento **40B** no. 1 (1977), 67–89.

[14] E. Noether: Invariante Variationsprobleme Nachr. D. König. Gesellsch. D. Wiss. Zu Göttingen, Math-phys. Klasse 1918: 235-257. (At `http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0503066v1` it is possible to find an English translation of this paper).

[15] P. J. Olver: Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations, Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993

[16] J.R. Ray and M. Lutzky: *General Hamiltonian form of Noether's theorem with applications to time-dependent nonlinear oscillators*, Il Nuovo Cimento **70** n. 2, 190–200.

[17] G. Ricci and T. Levi-Civita: *Méthodes de calcul différentiel absolu et leurs applications*, Math. Ann. **54** (1901), 125–201.

[18] W. Sarlet and F. Cantrijn: *Generalizations of Noether's Theorem in Classical Mechanics*, SIAM Review **23** No. 4 (1981), 467–494.

[19] J. Struckmeier and C. Riedel: *Noether's theorem and Lie symmetries for time-dependent Hamilton-Lagrange systems*, Physical Review E **66**, 066605 (2002).